

REMARKS

In response to the non-final office action of May 2, 2005, applicants asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

Claims 1-7, 9, 14 and 27-71 are now pending, of which claims 1, 27, 36, 45, 54 and 63 are independent. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 14 and 27 have been amended, claims 8, 10-13 and 15-26 have been canceled, and claims 27-71 have been added. Support for these amendments may be found in the application at, for example, page 19, line 25 to page 20, line 6, and Figs. 2A, 2B, 9A, 9B and 10B. No new matter has been introduced.

The title and specification have been amended in response to the objections. No new matter has been introduced. The amendments are believed to address all of the Examiner's concerns.

As amended, claim 1 is directed to a semiconductor device having a substrate, a pixel portion over the substrate, a driving circuit over the substrate, and an integrated circuit that at least partially overlaps with the driving circuit. The driving circuit and the integrated circuit each have at least one terminal. In particular, the driving circuit has at least one first terminal, and the integrated circuit has at least one second terminal. The first terminal and the second terminal face each other and are electrically connected via a conductive material.

Claims 1-26 have been rejected as being anticipated by Kato, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0231263. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Kato does not describe or suggest a first terminal and a second terminal that face each other and are electrically connected via a conductive material, as recited in amended independent claim 1. Instead, Kato describes an active matrix semiconductor display device having an active matrix liquid crystal display portion in which a liquid crystal layer is sandwiched by a pixel substrate and an opposing substrate. The pixel substrate includes a pixel region and a gate signal line driving circuit. The opposing substrate includes a source signal line driver circuit and a logic circuit. See Kato at paragraph [0076].

For at least these reasons, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and claims 2-7, 9 and 14, which depend from claim 1.

Each of newly added claims 27-71 is directed to a semiconductor device. Newly added independent claims 45 and 63 each recite a driving circuit that has at least one first terminal, and an integrated circuit that has at least one second terminal, where the first terminal and the second terminal face each other, and are electrically connected via a conductive material. For at least the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1, applicant submits that claims 45 and 63 are allowable, as are their dependent claims 46-53 and 64-71.

Each of newly added independent claims 27 and 54 recites an integrated circuit that at least partially overlaps with a driving circuit, with an adhesive layer between the integrated circuit and the driving circuit. Kato does not disclose these features. For at least this reason, applicant submits independent claims 27 and 54 are allowable, as are their dependent claims 28-35 and 55-62.

Newly added independent claim 36 recites a first integrated circuit that at least partially overlaps with a driving circuit and a second integrated circuit that at least partially overlaps with the first driving circuit. These features are not disclosed in Kato. For at least this reason, applicant submits that independent claim 36 and its dependent claims 37-44 are allowable.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.136, applicant hereby petitions that the period for response to the action dated May 2, 2005, be extended for one month to and including September 2, 2005.

Applicant : Shunpei Yamazaki et al.
Serial No. : 10/774,700
Filed : February 10, 2004
Page : 16 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-211001 / US6966

Enclosed is a check in the amount of \$1920.00 for excess claim fees (\$1800.00) and for the Petition for Extension of Time fee (\$120.00). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 31, 2005

Barbara A. Benoit

Barbara A. Benoit
Reg. No. 54,777

Customer No.: 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40294002.doc